

Remarks

Claims 1, 5, 9, 11-13, and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,139), herein referred to “Yun”, in view of Murai (U.S. Patent No. 5,986,726), and further in view of Williamson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,381), herein referred to as “Williamson”.

Of the above-referenced claims, Claims 1, 5, and 18 are independent. Accordingly, once patentability of these claims is established, all claims depending therefrom are likewise patentable.

Claims 1 and 5 recite in part, “an information processing module mounted on a rear surface of the mold frame, the information processing including a central processing unit generating control signals and a video signal processing unit generating video signals, . . . an input unit provided externally to the monitor unit and connected to the information processing unit”. Likewise, **Claim 18** recites similar subject matter.

In rejecting the independent claims, the Examiner indicated that Yun discloses an information (a driving circuit board 23) inherently including a video signal processing unit for generating video signals and for providing video signals to the liquid crystal panel via a flexible film (page 3 of the Office Action).

The Examiner then relies on Murai to disclose an information processing module mounted on a rear surface of the mold frame, as recited in Claims 1 and 5, as well as an information processing module attached to the rear surface of the mold frame and disposed in the receiving space defined by the rear surface of the mold frame, as recited in Claim 18 (page 5 of the Office Action).

The Examiner further cites Williamson as disclosing the central processing unit is comprised in the information processing unit as recited in Claims 1, 5, and 18. The Examiner finally concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Williamson's teaching above in the information processing apparatus of Yun.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yun, as well as Munai, merely indicate the presence of a driving circuit board 23 and 4 (column 2, lines 18-20 of Yun) and (column 4, lines 1-4 of Munai). There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in either reference that such a driver circuit constitutes or comprises an information processing module comprising a central processing unit generating control signals or a video signal processing unit generating video signals. Indeed, since both references relate to portable or "laptop" computers, it is respectfully submitted that both the CPU and the video processor of both references conventionally reside in the main body, e.g., keyboard, of the device (see Background on page 2, lines 2-5 of Applicants' originally filed application). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the driving circuit board of Yun and Munai does not correspond to the information processing module of the present invention, but corresponds to the printed circuit board (PCB) of the present invention.

In contrast to Yun and Murai, Williamson relates to a special purpose "handheld computer" in the nature of a "personal digital assistant" (PDA). In this regard, Williamson arguably discloses a device having a LCD and a central processing unit disposed within the same casing.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Williamson's teaching

above in the information processing apparatus of Yun, i.e., locating the Yun central processing unit in the Yun information processing unit, because this would fit all the elements in the same casing, thereby reducing the size of the apparatus, which is small enough to fit into a pocket, as taught by Williamson” [emphasis added (bottom of page 6 and top of page 7 of the Office Action)], Applicants respectfully submit there is no such suggestion or motivation to combine the teaching of Yun, Munai, and Williamson to arrive at Applicants’ claimed invention.

In this regard, as indicated above, Applicants’ claimed subject matter includes “an input unit provided **externally** to the monitor unit and connected to the information processing unit” (emphasis added). As such, Applicants claimed subject matter relates, not to a handheld device, such as Williamson’s PDA, but to portable or laptop computers that conventionally include an externally or rotatably attached main body or input device such a keyboard. “[F]itting all the elements in the same case, thereby reducing the size of the apparatus, which is small enough to fit into a pocket” is not an objective of Applicants’ claimed subject matter. Actually, combining the information processing unit of Williamson within the device of Yun would result, as occurred in Applicants’ LCD, in an increase in thickness (page 17, line 20 of Applicants’ originally filed application). The only motivation to combine Yun, which relates to portable or laptop device, with Williamson, which relates to handheld devices, is gleaned from impermissible hindsight.


As disclosed by Applicants, “Once information processing module 540 is accommodated within the interior of LCD 500 as described above, it is advantageous in that the space having been occupied by the main body of the computer system can be utilized for another use when the main body of the computer system and monitor unit are separately

formed” (page 17, lines 20-24 of Applicants’ originally filed application). As such, one novel and nonobvious aspect of Applicants’ claimed subject matter is that the main body and monitor unit remain as separate items, connected electrically, while taking the information processing unit from the main body and locating it in the monitor unit thus creating space within the main body for “other uses”. In this regard, the vagueness of “other uses” implies Applicants’ motivation for locating the information processing unit in the monitor was simply because space was available in the monitor. Such a relocation of the information processing unit into the monitor without a foreseeable use for the space made available in the main body only supports a lack of suggestion or motivation in combining the Yun and Williamson references.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that without the use of Applicants’ specification as a “blueprint” there is no suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine Yun, Munai, and Williamson to arrive at Applicants’ claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-2257.

Certification of Electronic Transmission
I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

November 10, 2008
Nuo Qu Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Mark Pellegrini
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 50,233